

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 26 2007

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

2

REMARKS

Entry of this Response is believed proper since no new issues are being raised which would require the Examiner's further consideration and/or search.

Claims 1-30 are all the claims presently pending in this application.

Claims 1-16 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 further in view of Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985.

Claims 18, 22-23, 27 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Igarashi et al., "An Architecture for Pen-based Interaction on Electronic Whiteboards."

Claims 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Fenster, U.S. Pat. No. 5,454,371.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Tanaka, U.S. Pat. No. 5,249,296.

Claims 17, 19, 26, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**MAR 26 2007**Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

3

I. APPLICANT'S CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention (as defined, for example, by independent claim 1) is directed to an application method for supporting a medical treatment system, the system comprising an input/display device including input means and display means, and a storage, the method including, the input/display device receiving input by handwriting, determining whether a data identifier has been received in the handwriting, storing data in the storage substantially all as medical data, the input means moving in a sliding manner on a sheet label displayed at a particular position on a screen by the display means, and the input/display device reading, when the input means moves onto the sheet label, data stored in the storage in relation to the sheet label from the storage, and displaying the data by conducting a change-over operation for the sheet label.

Conventionally, a user's knowledge of complex specifications is required for to master the operation method of a conventional device which requires a long period of time to learn and operate and consequently disadvantageously occurs in a case where the operator must search for appropriate operation when conducting an input operation. (Application at page 4, line 5 to page 5, line 11).

The claimed invention (e.g., as recited in claims 1, 9 and 28), on the other hand, includes the input/display device receiving input by handwriting and determining whether a data identifier has been received in the handwriting. This feature is important to locate and intra-identifier code which may be associated with the data identifier and free input to thereby record the intra-identifier code. (Application at page 18, line 22 to page 19, line 2).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 26 2007

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

4

II. THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**A. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 further in view of Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985**

The Examiner alleges that Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446, (Montlick), further in view of Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985, (Snell), makes obvious the invention of claims 1-16 and 24.

Applicant submits, however, that neither Montlick, nor Snell, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting," of claims 1 and 9.

The Examiner states in the Office Action that, "Montlick does not expressly disclose, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting.""

The Examiner alleges that Snell "determines if a gesture has been entered as part of the handwriting and performs tasks based on the identifier of the gesture," (Office Action at page 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's interpretation of the gesture of Snell somehow including an "identifier of the gesture," (the Examiner fails to specify where Snell teaches or suggests "an identifier of the gesture"), being equivalent to Applicant's "data identifier" "received in said handwriting."

Snell's gesture as disclosed by Snell fails to include any identifier whatsoever, muchless an identifier that identifies data.

However, Snell discloses that gestures are an alternative way of entering certain functions with respect to the computer 100. Snell presents an example of a "cross out" gesture being equivalent of a delete command that may, by example, eliminate a medical procedure from a suggestion list of medical procedures, or to delete a pending request to print

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

5

from the print queue.

One of the challenges in developing a pen-based user interface for manipulating medical data is providing appropriate commands to allow the physician or medical specialist to move selected portions of the data scroll 268 into a visible segment 270 of the data scroll 268 that is visible on a window of a screen display. One set of such commands relies on the capacity of the tablet computer 100 (FIG. 1) to recognize gestures. Gestures provide an alternative to tapping buttons or tapping and dragging icons (described in connection with FIG. 4). The present invention uses gestures for a variety of functions. One such use is the "cross out" gesture which is used to simultaneously select and delete an item from a list. Typical uses of the cross out gesture could include eliminating a medical procedure from a suggested list of medical procedures provided to the physician or medical specialist, or deleting a pending request to print from the print queue. (Emphasis added.) (Column 18, lines 28-45.)

Snell fails to teach or suggest the gestures that are provided as an alternative to tapping buttons or tapping and dragging icons containing a data identifier that is received when the gestures are reduced to handwriting on the computer 100. There is no teaching or suggestion that the gestures either contain, or are themselves a data identifier, but are merely an alternative way of inputting functions into computer 100.

Snell fails to teach or suggest, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting." Therefore, Snell fails to overcome the deficiencies of Montlick.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art references (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

B. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Igarashi et al., "An Architecture for Pen-based Interaction on Electronic Whiteboards"

The Examiner alleges that Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No.

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

6

5,724,985, (Montlick and Snell), further in view of Igarashi et al., "An Architecture for Pen-based Interaction on Electronic Whiteboards", (Igarashi), makes obvious the invention of claims 18, 22-23, 27 and 30.

Applicant submits, however, that neither Montlick and Snell, nor Igarashi, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting," of independent claims 1 and 9 with respect to dependent claims 18 and 22-23, 27 and 30.

See Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1 and 9 in section A., above, with respect to neither Montlick, nor Snell, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting," of claims 1 and 9.

Igarashi discloses a whiteboard interface design for informal office work including techniques for the management of space on the board, the ability to flexibly apply behaviors to support varied applications semantics, and mechanisms for managing history on the board.

Igarashi fails to teach or suggest, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting." Therefore, Igarashi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Montlick and Snell.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art references (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

7

C. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Fenster, U.S. Pat. No. 5,454,371

The Examiner alleges that Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985, (Montlick and Snell), further in view of Fenster, U.S. Pat. No. 5,454,371, (Fenster), makes obvious the invention of claims 20-21.

Applicant submits, however, that neither Montlick and Snell, nor Fenster, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, “determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting,” of independent claim 1 with respect to dependent claims 20-21.

See Applicant’s arguments with respect to independent claim 1 in section A., above, with respect to neither Montlick, nor Snell, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, “determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting,” of claim 1.

Fenster discloses a three-dimensional ultrasound imaging system includes an ultrasound probe to direct ultrasound waves to and to receive reflected ultrasound waves from a target volume of a subject under examination.

Fenster fails to teach or suggest, “determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting.” Therefore, Fenster fails to overcome the deficiencies of Montlick and Snell.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art references (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant’s claimed invention.

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

8

D. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of Tanaka, U.S. Pat. No. 5,249,296

The Examiner alleges that Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985, (Montlick and Snell), further in view of further in view of Tanaka, U.S. Pat. No. 5,249,296, (Tanaka), makes obvious the invention of claim 25.

Applicant submits, however, that neither Montlick and Snell, nor Tanaka, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting," of independent claim 1 with respect to dependent claim 25.

See Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claim 1 in section A., above, with respect to neither Montlick, nor Snell, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting," of claim 1.

Tanaka discloses an information processing apparatus for controlling window positions comprising a pen for inputting coordinate information, a tablet for generating coordinate data based on coordinate information input by the pen onto the tablet, a display placed under the tablet in such a manner that an image on the display is visible through the tablet means, and first display control means for opening in a predetermined position a new window corresponding to the icon selected by a checking (pen down, pen up at a single icon location) operation of the pen.

Tanaka fails to teach or suggest, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting." Therefore, Tanaka fails to overcome the deficiencies of Montlick and Snell.

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

9

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art references (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

E. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection over Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985 further in view of further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art

The Examiner alleges that Montlick, U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,446 and Snell, U.S. Pat. No. 5,724,985, (Montlick and Snell), further in view of further in view of Tanaka, U.S. Pat. No. 5,249,296, (AAPA), makes obvious the invention of claims 17, 19, 26, 28 and 29.

Applicant submits, however, that neither Montlick and Snell, nor AAPA, nor any alleged combination thereof, teaches or suggests, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting," of claim 1, and, "means for determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting input," of claim 28.

The Examiner states in the Office Action that, "Montlick does not expressly disclose, 'determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting.'"

The Examiner alleges that Snell "determines if a gesture has been entered as part of the handwriting and performs tasks based on the identifier of the gesture," (Office Action at page 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's interpretation of the gesture of Snell somehow including an "identifier of the gesture," (to which the Examiner fails to specify where Snell teaches or suggests "an identifier of the gesture"), being equivalent to Applicant's "data identifier" "received in said handwriting."

Snell's gesture as disclosed by Snell fails to include any identifier whatsoever.

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

10

especially an identifier that corresponds to any particular data.

However, Snell does disclose that gestures are an alternative way of entering certain functions with respect to the computer 100. Snell presents an example of a "cross out" gesture being equivalent of a delete command that may, by example, eliminate a medical procedure from a suggestion list of medical procedures, or to delete a pending request to print from the print queue.

One of the challenges in developing a pen-based user interface for manipulating medical data is providing appropriate commands to allow the physician or medical specialist to move selected portions of the data scroll 268 into a visible segment 270 of the data scroll 268 that is visible on a window of a screen display. One set of such commands relies on the capacity of the tablet computer 100 (FIG. 1) to recognize gestures. Gestures provide an alternative to tapping buttons or tapping and dragging icons (described in connection with FIG. 4). The present invention uses gestures for a variety of functions. One such use is the "cross out" gesture which is used to simultaneously select and delete an item from a list. Typical uses of the cross out gesture could include eliminating a medical procedure from a suggested list of medical procedures provided to the physician or medical specialist, or deleting a pending request to print from the print queue. (Emphasis added.) (Column 18, lines 28-45.)

Snell fails to teach or suggest the gestures that are provided as an alternative to tapping buttons or tapping and dragging icons a containing a data identifier that is received when the gestures are reduced to handwriting on the computer 100. There is no teaching or suggestion at the gestures contain or are themselves a data identifier, but are merely an alternative way of inputting functions into computer 100.

Snell fails to teach or suggest, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting." Therefore, Snell fails to overcome the deficiencies of Montlick.

AAPA fails to teach or suggest, "determining whether a data identifier has been received in said handwriting." Therefore, AAPA fails to overcome the deficiencies of

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

11

Montlick and Snell.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art references (alone or in combination) fail to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 26 2007

Application No. 09/989,437
Docket No. DP-820 US

12

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-30, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:

March 26, 2007



Donald J. Lecher, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,933
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,386

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 the enclosed Request for Reconsideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 to Examiner HOLTON, Art Unit 2629, on March 19, 2007.



Donald J. Lecher, Esq.
Registration No. 41,933
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386